

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 934

JC 720 166

AUTHOR Rasmuson, N. Arthur
TITLE The Implementation of SB 696 at Glendale College.
PUB DATE Jun 72
NOTE 37p.; Seminar paper

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Techniques; Faculty Evaluation; *Instructional Improvement; *Junior Colleges; Self Evaluation; *State Legislation; *Teacher Evaluation

IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

In reaction to the passage of the Rodda Bill (SB 696, 1971 legislative session), this study concentrates on the instruments and procedures proposed for use in evaluating faculty at Glendale College (California). The two proposals analyzed are administrative viewpoint and faculty opinion. The purpose of this paper is threefold: (1) to measure the implementation of SB 696 against the purpose of the bill and the guidelines developed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges; (2) to attempt to compare administrative and faculty opinions regarding evaluation; and (3) to compare both proposals against the suggested evaluation system of educational theorists. The goals of SB 696 depend on several factors: (1) whether the legislature will give the academic community enough time to experiment and devise sound techniques; (2) whether the local boards are willing to make financial investments on the implementation of SB 696; and (3) whether the teachers themselves view this process as a useful one for the improvement of instruction. (RG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 063934

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SB 696 AT GLENDALE COLLEGE

by

N. Arthur Rasmuson

JC 720 166

Education 441-D
Dr. Frederick C. Kintzer
June, 1972

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 9 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

During 1971, it became apparent to any casual observer of the legislative scene in Sacramento that some considerable changes were in prospect with regard to tenure at all levels of education: K-12 districts, community colleges, state colleges, and the University. The sources of public and legislative dissatisfaction ranged from student riots, faculty involvement in protests, and changed faculty mores to suspicions that the teaching profession was harboring or protecting many incompetants. It was also fueled by public concern over low scores on achievement tests administered at the lower levels of education and the increased militancy of the profession through the American Federation of Teachers and even the California Teachers Association.

At any rate, bills were introduced into the legislative hopper ranging from modification to complete abolition of tenure. Most of these proposals were either left in committees or else voted down. However, two important pieces of legislation did emerge. The Stull Bill (AB 293) which affected the K-12 districts and the Rodda Bill (SB 696) relating to community colleges.

In an analysis of SB 696, a number of things are of paramount importance. First of all, although tenure as a principle was retained, there were some modifications. One of the major changes is that dismissal proceedings for tenured instructors do not have to be adjudicated in the courtroom but instead can be handled by either an Arbitrator or a Hearing Officer. His decision is final and binding unless procedural issues are involved. Another substantive change is that first-year teachers may be

dismissed at the discretion of a local board. The third change and the one which so far has occupied the time and attention of so many educators is the provision that all community college personnel, with the exception of superintendents, assistant superintendents, deputy superintendents, and presidents must be evaluated at least once every two years. Beginning September 1, 1972, plans and instruments must be devised which will rate tenured faculty, counselors, librarians, and administrators below the rank of president.

After the passage of SB 696, the Dean of Instruction at Glendale College wrote a proposal which would serve as a catalytic agent. It was never intended as other than a preliminary document. It did not, for example, contain any instruments to facilitate the procedures. However, the plan which he outlined did represent what he thought was germane to the evaluation process. Title "Procedures for Evaluation and Improvement of Instruction," it was submitted to the Faculty Senate. Simultaneously, the Senate directed its Instructional Affairs Committee, composed of one counselor and six other faculty members, to examine the proposal and to make any necessary additions or deletions. This Policy Development Procedure is employed at Glendale College to facilitate policy development. The Administration and Faculty Senate study proposals and counter-proposals. Differences are resolved in a conference committee and then approved by the Executive Committee (composed primarily of administrators) and the Faculty Senate. If amendments are not approved by both groups, further conferences are arranged until, through a series of compromises, a final policy is adopted with which both faculty and administrators can live. If it is appropriate, the policy change is then sent to the Board of

Education through the Superintendent's office.

As this paper is being written, the two proposals are in the conference stage. It appears doubtful, however, that final agreement will be achieved much before mid-summer. Therefore, this paper does not present an analysis of the final product but rather, an analysis of two documents --one, which is the product of administrative thinking, and the other of faculty opinion. Appendix A and Appendix B must not be construed as final positions, but rather as positions advanced prior to negotiation and compromise.

This paper will concentrate on only one aspect of the mandate from Sacramento: the evaluation of faculty, and more particularly, an analysis of the instruments and procedures developed at Glendale College which seek to perform that task. It will try to measure the implementation of SB 696 against the spirit of the Bill itself and the Guidelines developed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Secondly, it will attempt to compare administrative thinking with faculty opinion in regard to evaluation. And finally, this paper will try to make some comparisons of the two proposals against what educational theorists have suggested as fundamental to a sound evaluation system.

Although generally thought of as legislation dealing with evaluation, the bulk of SB 696 is concerned with the procedural aspects of penalizing in some fashion the incompetent teacher or separating him from the profession. Very little is said about the evaluative process other than to identify who is to be evaluated and how often. This, of course, was not accidental. Acting upon the advice of various educator groups (1), the Legislature deemed it wise to allow the profession to construct the criteria of evaluation.

As community college educators read this bill, however, with its emphasis on how tenured teachers can and shall be eliminated, it is not surprising that many of the delegates to the December, 1971 San Francisco Workshop of teachers, administrators, and trustees echoed the sentiments of the Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Evaluation that evaluation should be for the purpose of improving education and not to be interpreted as authorizing any kind of "witch-hunt" in the profession (2). This basic assumption was reinforced by the Guidelines on Evaluation adopted by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and subsequently distributed to all community colleges in California (3). Those persons at Glendale College--both the Dean of Instruction and faculty--who were charged with the responsibility of implementing SB 696 were present at the San Francisco Workshop. For this reason, the Faculty Senate of Glendale College included in its position advocacy of what amount to a "Bill of Rights" for teachers in the evaluation process. Quite clearly, they see the appraisal of teaching related solely to competence in the classroom. The administrative plan implies this but the faculty proposal spells it out in detail. Factors such as life styles, personal taste in clothing, or membership in professional organizations, for example, may not be brought within the scope of evaluation. Nor may anything which falls into the framework of the AAUP definition of academic freedom be a factor in judging faculty. It also reminds the evaluator that a lack of orthodoxy in the classroom cannot be used as a basis for rendering an unsatisfactory judgment (Appendix B, III, A-H).

When we turn to the criteria of evaluation, we find that there is rather common agreement between faculties, administrators, and those

connected with the research and teaching function in Schools of Education. Almost all concur that basic to any system of evaluation should be input from the evaluatee (self-evaluation), peer groups, administration, and students. There are, however, some differences of opinion as to the relative weight each input is assigned. In a state-wide sampling of opinion conducted by Los Angeles Pierce College, most instructors ranked peer evaluation as the most useful followed by self-evaluation. Student participation was viewed with less enthusiasm. The data on the state-wide sample do not provide a clear-cut positioning of the administrator's role. The pilot study which Pierce College made, however, during the summer of 1971 in the Los Angeles Community College District indicates that instructors preferred peer, administrator, student, and self evaluation in that order (11).

At Glendale College, both the blueprint from the faculty and the administration plan place considerable emphasis upon self-evaluation. Both agree that the criteria should include expertise in subject-matter, techniques associated with instruction and their affectiveness, the review of student evaluation, and responsibilities in the college or community other than teaching.

The faculty suggests that the instructor answer a series of questions relating to subject-matter, techniques of instruction, etc. and how he or she is upgrading courses, instructional approaches and student rapport. Self-evaluation by its very nature tends to be subjective, but the questionnaire tries to avoid this by asking very specific questions of the evaluatee such as "what have you been doing" and "what are you going to do" in the future. This then becomes a clear objective and the instructor can

subsequently measure what he read or what courses he took to upgrade his expertise in subject matter. In other words, the instructor sets the goals and then later can judge himself in terms of reaching those objectives. Most teachers probably do much of this sort of thing subconsciously but the questionnaire which the faculty has devised forces everyone to deal squarely with the problem of goal-setting and goal-measurement.

In the area of adjunct assignments, however, further questions could be asked relative to the goals the instructor set for the future in college or community responsibilities. Such a response might well take the direction of working in the Faculty Senate, serving on divisional committees, becoming part of the Speakers Bureau, participating in the political life of the community, or joining a service club. The list is endless. While most instructors would probably agree that all of this takes time away from teaching (2), the day is long past for instructors to remain isolated in the cloister of their subject or classroom. This is especially true, for example, as faculties ask for and receive shared roles in the governance of their collegial institutions. And not to be dismissed too lightly is the responsibility which faculties must assume within the community if they expect to receive continued support from the public.

After self-evaluation is completed by the instructor, peer groups are then established under both the administrative and faculty proposals to determine the teaching effectiveness of the instructor. The faculty limits the criteria to classroom performance; the Dean expands this to include such factors as adjunct responsibilities (non-classroom) and participation in inservice programs. The peer groups begin by studying

the self-evaluation form and then meet with the evaluatee. Included within this framework are visits to the classroom, although some would question this practice on the basis that they do not do their best when being "observed" (11). Cohen suggests, with regard to classroom visitation, that rater bias may also intrude because there is no objective criterion (7).

The Dean of Instruction and the Faculty Senate differ sharply with each other in terms of the composition of the peer group evaluating non-tenured faculty. The Dean's proposal suggests himself, the Division Chairman and one tenured member of the Division selected by the evaluatee. This is the practice currently employed at Glendale College. The faculty plan eliminates the Dean of Instruction from the evaluating team. The rationale is that the Dean--who is not a subject-matter expert--cannot possibly judge the value of the instructor's goals. Also, by the nature of his job he has loyalties and responsibilities which may place him in conflict with the academic scene in the classroom; the implementation of Board policy and its interpretation is often cited. With regard to tenured faculty, both the administration and the faculty agree that the Dean shall not be included. The only difference is that while the faculty suggests that the Division Chairman or his designee be involved, the administrative proposal mandates the Division Chairman. In both plans, the second member of the team is a faculty person from the Division chosen by the evaluatee. The reason given for allowing the Division Chairman to designate someone else is the workload involved. Undoubtedly, this is also behind the Dean's suggestion that he be eliminated from the review of tenured

faculty at the first level of evaluation. The magnitude of assessing fifty or sixty faculty each year staggers the imagination!

The composition of the evaluation team is a most interesting dimension of the problem. At least one study has suggested that administrative review of probationary teachers is the most reliable predictor of success (7). But the participants at the San Francisco Workshop could not achieve any kind of consensus on including administrators in the process of evaluation (2). The Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Evaluation recommended that administrators remain outside the process except to oversee and assure its integrity and academic soundness (1).

The question of whether to include administrators in the initial stage of faculty evaluation is related to another dimension of peer evaluation. The presumption of faculty is that only within a discipline can the goals of the instructor be understood and therefore evaluated. The peer team is expected to determine, for example, the instructor's depth and breadth of knowledge and whether he maintains currency in his field. Exactly how is that to be determined? Expertise, all are agreed, is an important criterion, but how is it measured? Perhaps even more relevant are the questions in Appendix 1 of the faculty proposal relating to effectiveness of instruction and success reached in attaining instructional objectives. Again, how is that determined? If the objectives are clearly enough stated, could not a person from outside the discipline participate in a determination of whether those goals had been reached? That admission is made by the administrative proposal regarding a tenured instructor deemed unsatisfactory at the divisional level; the Dean's plan mandates an extension of

the team well behind the original peer group. This is, of course, the conclusion reached by a number of studies concerned with evaluation. Most of the work done by Cohen and Brewer (7), Israel (12), O'Conner (15), and many others suggest that the ultimate criterion in evaluating teaching is the learning gain displayed by the student measured against the objectives and goals of the instructor. Of course many faculty would quickly counter that, while perhaps cognitive learning can be assessed, it is most difficult to measure affective learning. Many faculty would probably agree with Popham (17) and Gustad (10) that much work remains to be done in building tests which really determine learning gain. Nevertheless, there is a challenge here. Government, industry and public pressures indicate that the time has come to produce some kind of visible evidence that learning gains are occurring. The United States Office of Education, for example, has created eighty-six positions on their staff. Calling them "accomplishment auditors," they are seeking to determine whether the millions of dollars spent by the federal government is expended wisely (18). It might be wiser for the academic community to construct such tools themselves rather than have them externally devised.

With regard to student participation, the profession does not appear to be in complete agreement. In a sampling of community college faculty opinion in California, the Pierce Study showed that 71% of tenured faculty and 73% of probationary faculty supported student involvement in faculty evaluation (11). Many of the participants in the San Francisco Workshop raised the typical questions of student input although most accepted it as necessary. Cohen, however, (6) questions student input because it may be

less than objective. He makes the same case, of course, for the lack of objectivity in peer and administrative evaluation as he constructs the logic for what he considers the ultimate criterion--learning gain.

Very high on most lists which designate areas of student competence in assessing instruction is the effectiveness of the teacher in stimulating learning, the degree of interest which the course incokes, the format of the class and the materials used in teaching the course (9). Students themselves would tend to agree that these criteria are the most relevant (14).

At any rate, both faculty and administrative thinking at Glendale College includes student evaluation as part of the process in assessing instruction. The faculty proposal is rather precise in pointing out what aspects of instruction can be evaluated. Factors dealing with content, style of presentation, and effectiveness in stimulating learning are included as within the purview of the students. The depth of the instructor's knowledge is not however, subject to review. Nor are the goals and objectives of the teacher to be evaluated by the students. Students might disagree, however, with the latter exclusion. In the last few years they seem less and less willing to accept externally applied objectives set by their professors. Or, conversely, students are reacting to the lack of clear objectives. But if the students disagree with the objectives of a course (assuming that they are made clear at the beginning of the class) some of them will undoubtedly make "specific suggestions" which will be fed into both the self and peer aspects of evaluation. One of the most germane questions in the self-evaluation quadrant is the evaluatee's reaction to student input.

Turning now to the last input of evaluation--the role of the administrator--it has already been noted that the faculty blueprint does not envision the Dean of Instruction participating at the first level of the process. This first level of evaluation, conducted by the division is a process which seeks to evaluate growth of the instructor. Nor does the administrative proposal suggest an involvement of administrators with the exception of probationary teachers.

Instead, it is at the second level of evaluation, when retention of the instructor is in question, that both faculty and administrative proposals contemplate the use of administrative personnel. The faculty blueprint is much more elaborate. It constructs an extended team to sit in judgement if there are questions raised at the initial stage. The administrative plan by-passes this procedure. At any rate, an instructor who is rated unsatisfactory by peer and extended peer groups eventually faces evaluation by a much larger team. And that team includes, in both proposals, the Dean of Instruction. The evaluation process really stops here for recommendations are then sent on to the president for action. In the faculty plan the teacher is granted a final hearing before the president; he is also advised of his right to legal counsel. In both proposals, the president then makes a recommendation to the Board.

The final evaluation and termination phase in the faculty plan has very carefully insisted upon protecting the teacher from irrelevant charges and related the question of satisfactory or unsatisfactory solely to the classroom and the instructor's competence in teaching. Given the political climate and the attacks upon tenure as a principle, this is not too surprising. For if issues involving academic freedom

or the instructor's civil rights are brought into the process, then the courtroom once again becomes the scene and the basic purpose of SB 696, as teachers view it, is vitiated.

It is really quite difficult to determine precisely the individual motives which prompted legislators to enact SB 696. But one thing is quite obvious. Community college educators (11) and their counter-parts in Schools of Education (4) see evaluation as means of improving instruction. The Dean of Instruction states clearly that there "shall be a well-organized and implemented improvement of instruction and evaluation program" and that the District should "provide incentives for self improvement" (Appendix A). The faculty blueprint takes this one step further and outlines a series of workshops, lectures, programs, and campus visitations which would implement this objective. Perhaps the one significant omission, however, is the lack of any clearly defined method of helping instructors who have been rated unsatisfactory. There can be little doubt that the built-in mechanism of the peer group would make the attempt but its base might not be broad enough. It may be possible as Case has suggested (5) that some kind of larger group could be assembled for the purpose of helping to develop further the potential of all instructors--both experienced and inexperienced, successful and somewhat less than successful. Another approach might be the development of a Learning Center or a Clinic for the Improvement of Instruction where teachers could turn for specific advice on upgrading their instructional techniques. Such service could range from helping them write better tests to developing a multimedia approach in their subject-area.

The long-range outcome of SB 696 at Glendale College and elsewhere remains unclear. A worthwhile evaluation of faculty and its concomitant--the improvement of instruction--will depend upon whether the Legislature permits the academic community enough time to experiment and to devise sound techniques. It also depends on local boards for they are going to have to make a financial investment if the process is to be anything more than routine. In the final analysis, however, improvement of instruction--which the profession claims should be the principal purpose of evaluation--rests with teachers themselves. If they view evaluation as perfunctory or simply another piece of paperwork, then negative results can be predicted. Instead, educators must invest a considerable amount of their own time and energy in the process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Evaluation for the California Community Colleges, Administration of Tenure-Proposed Changes in Policies and Practices in the California Community Colleges, Sacramento, California Community Colleges, 1971.
2. Axen, Richard, ed., "Summary of Small Group Discussions at: Community College Teacher Evaluation Workshop, December 9-10," San Francisco, 1971.
3. Board of Governors, California Community Colleges, "Guidelines for Improvement of Instruction in the California Community Colleges," Sacramento, 1971.
4. Boyer, Marcia, "Teacher Evaluation: Toward Improving Instruction," Junior College Research Review 4:5; January, 1970.
5. Case, Chester H., "Beyond Evaluation: The Quality Control Model of Evaluation and the Development Model for Faculty Growth and Evaluation," Berkeley, University of California, 1971.
6. Cohen, Arthur M., et al., A Constant Variable: New Perspectives on the Community College, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.
7. Cohen, Arthur M. and Brawer, Florence B., Measuring Faculty Performance, Monograph No. 4, Washington, D.C. American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
8. Cohen, Arthur M. and Brawer, Florence B., The Who, What, Why of Instructor Evaluation, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 33, Los Angeles, University of California, 1972.
9. Deegan, William L., The Student Role in Evaluation of Community College Teaching; A Proposal for Balance and Fairness, Sacramento, California Junior College Association, 1971.
10. Gustad, John W., "Evaluation of Teaching Performance, Issues and Possibilities," in Lee, C., Improving College Teaching, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1967.
11. Innovations Committee, Los Angeles Pierce College, Guidelines for Evaluation in California Community Colleges: A Report Prepared for the Los Angeles Community College District Personnel, Woodland Hills, California, Pierce College, 1971.
12. Israel, Jack W., "Innovation in Evaluation: Teacher Assessment by Objectives," Unpublished seminar paper, Los Angeles, University of California, 1969.
13. Johnson, B. Lamar, ed., The Improvement of Junior College Instruction, Occasional Report No. 15, Junior College Leadership Program, Los Angeles, University of California, 1970.

14. Kurpka, John G., "Report on Faculty and Student Evaluation of Instructor Rating Questionnaire," Northhampton County, Penn., Northhampton County Area Community College, 1970.
15. O'Connor, Edward F. and Justiz, Tomas B., Identifying the Effective Instuctor, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 9, Los Angeles, University of California, 1970.
16. Popham, W. James, "California's New Teacher Evaluation Law," Unpublished Manuscript, Los Angeles, 1972.
17. Popham, W. James, Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems, Los Angeles, The Instructional Objectives Exchange, 1971.
18. Tucker, John M. and Wikerson, George J., "Measuring Faculty Effectiveness in the Community College: A Proposal," n.p. 1970.

INTERVIEWS

- Dr. Ivan Jones, Dean of Instruction, Glendale College.
- Dr. Jo Ray Cotton, Chairman, Faculty Senate, Policy Development Committee, Glendale College.
- Mr. Jeb Brighthouse, Member, Faculty Senate, Policy Development Committee, Glendale College.
- Mr. Drake Hawkins, Member, Faculty Senate, Policy Development Committee, Glendale College.

APPENDIX A - ADMINISTRATIVE PROPOSAL
AB-6

WORKING DRAFT: GUIDELINES FOR IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION
IN THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

I. Evaluation of Faculty

Local governing boards in consultation with faculty shall adopt rules and regulations establishing the specific procedures for evaluation of contract (former probationary) regular (formerly permanent) employees setting forth specific standards which they expect their certificated employees to meet in the performance of their duties. Such procedures and standards shall be uniform for all contract and be uniform for all regular employees of the district.¹

II. Criteria for Evaluation²

The criteria upon which each faculty person is to be evaluated should include:

- (a) Expertise in subject matter.
- (b) Techniques of instruction.
- (c) Acceptance of responsibility.
- (d) Effectiveness of communication.
- (e) Accomplishment of instruction.

III. Methods of Evaluation

Evaluation should include:

- (a) Self evaluation by the person evaluated.
- (b) Faculty peer evaluation - including in the area of his expertise.
- (c) Evaluation by students in classes and in extra curricular activities who have contact with the person evaluated.

¹ Senate Bill 696.

² Guidelines adopted by the Board of Governors in April 1971.

APPENDIX A - AB-6

- (d) Administrators, who shall review all reports of evaluation.
- (e) Final summation of the evaluation with the chief² administration recommendations shall go to the board.

IV. Number of Evaluations

All contract teachers shall be evaluated at least once a year.
All regular teachers shall be evaluated at least once every two years. ¹ & ²

V. Results of Negative Evaluation

Local governing boards shall establish criteria on negative evaluation which will be made known to all certificated personnel and which will result in::

- (a) Suspension from teaching.
- (b) Suspension from teaching and loss of all or part of the salary of the person suspended.
- (c) Possibility of postponement for one year before imposing penalties.
- (d) Instances of negative evaluation which will result in dismissal.¹

¹ Senate Bill 696

² Guidelines adopted by the Board of Governors in April 1971.

APPENDIX A - AB-6

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

The following procedures are designed to improve instruction, to identify and retain effective members of the professional staff and to provide assistance as soon as possible to members of the professional staff who may be in need of help.

In order for these procedures to be truly effective certain assessment guidelines governing this process and important to its objectives are to be understood and implemented. These are:

1. Individual differences among teachers, administrators, and staff are a strength to the total instructional program.
2. The professional staff of the district shall have a part in the continuing development of a well organized and implemented improvement of instruction and evaluation program.
3. The district, whenever possible, shall provide incentives for self improvement.
4. The results of all evaluation procedures shall be clearly and concisely reviewed with the appropriate staff member.
5. All members of the certificated staff shall be clearly informed on the procedures for the evaluation and improvement of instruction.
6. When position security is questioned or when an individual believes that an injustice has been done in personnel matters, he should have regularized means of review and hearing by a group in which his peers are represented. (Academic Due Process Procedure)
7. In evaluation of administrative personnel, a most important criterion should be the extent to which the positive leadership of the administrator has enabled those in his area of authority to achieve success in their endeavors.
8. Because of the nature of the administrator's role in the educational program, administrative personnel should be evaluated both by those whom they would lead and by those to whom they are responsible.
9. The primary responsibility for improvement remains with the individual staff member; however, assistance when needed shall be made available.

APPENDIX A - AB-6

The in-service and the evaluation program is built around a series of performance studies and review on an annual basis.

Peer and self-evaluation are basic in the evaluation process. In addition, follow-up conferences provide the member with face-to-face contact with evaluating staff members and result in a written summary of his classroom procedures and/or other professional activities. A staff member may examine his folder at any time, and copies of any material placed in the folders as a result of the procedures herein outlined are given to the faculty member for his information and personal files.

It is recognized that Placement Folders and certain letters of recommendation must, by their very nature, be confidential documents. Individual folders involving this category are maintained in the Personnel Office, Board of Education.

Certificated staff to be re-employed or recommended for tenure must fulfill their responsibilities and duties as outlined in Board policies and administration procedures.

Duties and responsibilities will be explained at the beginning of the school year to all new staff members and are included in the College Faculty Manual.

The Procedure

The procedures include (1) self-evaluation, (2) student evaluation, and (3) improvement and evaluation of instruction.

1. Self-evaluation

Self-evaluation is essential as the first step in improving the quality of instruction. A review of the self-evaluation should be made orally in conference with the individual's Improvement of Instruction team. Items to be covered shall include all areas of performance and participation of the instructor in the total program, specifically including:

- A. Expertise in subject matter
- B. Techniques of instruction
- C. Acceptance of responsibility adjunct to the regular assignment
- D. Effectiveness of communication
- E. Effectiveness of instruction
- F. Review of student evaluation

11. Student Evaluation

The faculty, plus other staff members whose responsibility brings them into contact with a sufficiently large enough segment of students for a statistically valid rating to be given, shall participate in student evaluation procedures and review the results with the Improvement of Instruction team during the self-evaluation conference.

APPENDIX A - AB-6

111. Improvement and Evaluation of InstructionA. The Improvement of Instruction Visitation Committee

The Improvement of Instruction Visitation Committee for non-tenured teachers shall be composed of three members: the Dean of Instruction, the Division Chairman, and one tenured teacher. The members of this Committee visit the probationary instructor while that instructor is conducting a class. The tenured instructor is selected by the probationary instructor from his division.

All areas of performance and participation of the instructor in the total program will be a consideration of the committee. Such responsibilities adjunct to their regular assignment but not limited to attendance at faculty meeting, attendance at division meeting, service on curriculum committees, participation in in-service program and professional attitude and growth are examples of professional responsibilities in addition to the classroom role.

1. All non-tenured instructors will be visited by the three staff members as follows:
 - a. A preliminary visit by each visitor will occur to assess the effectiveness of the instructor to cause student learning and the instructor's overall professional growth.
 - b. Following the preliminary visit, the visitor will hold a conference with the instructor to review his observations and findings.
 - c. If, as a result of the visit and conference, the visitor and instructor agree that the latter's work is satisfactory the visitor will complete and file with the Dean of Instruction a Visitation and Conference Report, indicating satisfactory performance, and the visitation and evaluation process is completed for that year.
 - d. If, on the other hand, the visitor has doubts as to the effectiveness of the instructor, he will indicate his reservations during the conference and attempt to help the instructor explore means for effecting improvement. In this case, no Visitation and Conference Report will be filed at this time.
2. Subsequent follow-up visits and conferences will be held if reservations about the instructor's effectiveness and/or professional growth have been expressed.
 - a. The visitor will re-visit and re-confer as many times as he feels necessary and appropriate.

APPENDIX A - AB-6

- b. If the follow-up visits and conferences demonstrate the instructor's satisfactory performance, the visitor will then file a Visitation and Conference Report, indicating thereon satisfactory performance, and the visitation and evaluation process will be completed for that year.
 - c. If, however, after appropriate follow-up, the visitor still feels that the instructor is not doing satisfactory work, he will file a report that clearly sets forth the problem and/or his reservations, and he will recommend on the report that an Evaluation Team be organized.
- 3. All tenured instructors will be visited at least once each two years in the classroom by his division chairman and one other tenured member of his division chosen by himself.
 - a. Following the classroom observation, the visitors will hold conferences with the instructor and submit Visitation and Conference Reports to the Dean.
 - b. Should either of the reports indicate unsatisfactory performance, the division chairman will select two additional members to make follow-up visits and conferences. Each of these members will also file a Visitation and Conference Report.
 - c. Should one of the two above mentioned additional reports indicate that the instructor's performance and/or professional growth is unsatisfactory, an evaluation team will be formed for further study and evaluation of the instructor.

B. The Evaluation Team

When an Improvement of Instruction Team recommends that an Evaluation Team be formed based upon the faculty member's overall performance such a team will be constituted. The team shall have the responsibility to evaluate the instructor's total performance and formulate a final recommendation. Such recommendation shall be made to the President.

- 1. The Evaluation Team shall be composed of five members:

One faculty member from outside the division chosen by the division chairman.

Two faculty members within the division chosen by the instructor.
The instructor's division chairman.

The Dean of Instruction

APPENDIX A - AB-6

2. The Evaluation Team will meet before any action to review previous reports and suggested proposals for overall improvement of the instructor involved. Each member of the Evaluation Team will then visit the classes of the instructor as many times as necessary to assess the performance of the instructor involved.
3. Each member of the team will collect such other data as pertains to the total performance of the instructor's duties as designated under "Instructor Duties and Responsibilities" in the Faculty Manual.
4. Each member will confer with the instructor and apprise him of his findings.
5. The folder of the instructor will be made available to any member of the Evaluation Team.
6. Following the conclusion of the visitations and collection of written reports, the chairman of the Evaluation Team will call together the Team for final action and recommendation.
7. The Dean of Instruction shall act as chairman and presiding officer at the meetings of the Evaluation Team.
8. This committee will review all facts and information available during this meeting. The instructor shall have the opportunity to initiate a written reaction to the evaluation. Such response shall become a permanent attachment to the employee's personnel file.
9. The committee will then develop and make a written recommendation regarding the instructor's re-employment or non-reemployment and submit to the President.
10. In no instance shall the Evaluation Team take any final action until that instructor has had the opportunity to appear before the Committee. The instructor may waive this opportunity.

APPENDIX A - AB-6

IV. Calendar for Personnel ProceduresDate Deadlines

December 15 - All performance studies and reviews relating to probationary instructions completed and recommendations filed with the Dean of Instruction.

Last Friday Before Christmas Vacation - Formation of all Evaluation Committees as recommended.

End of First Week in February - All permanent faculty scheduled for review evaluated by division personnel.

End of February - All Evaluation Team reports and recommendations filed with the President.

March 15 - Probationary instructors, whom the President will not recommend for retention, notified of right to hearing.

First Board of Trustees Meeting in May - Recommendation for employment or dismissal of probationary employees presented to Trustees. Action is taken by Board of Trustees, either to re-employ or to dismiss. Instructors informed in writing of decision to dismiss or to re-employ.

APPENDIX B - FACULTY SENATE PROPOSAL

PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION AND ADMINISTRATION

I. Introduction.

The following procedures are designed to improve instruction and administration, to provide assistance as soon as possible to members of the professional staff who may be in need of help, and to assure orderly and fair procedures for the non-retention of faculty and administrators who cannot meet standards of professional competence. In order for these procedures to be truly effective certain assessment guidelines governing this process and important to its objectives are to be understood and implemented.

A. Individual difference among teachers, administrators, and other professional staff members are a strength to the total instructional program.

B. The professional staff of the district shall have a part in the continuing development of a well-organized and implemented program for the evaluation and improvement of instruction and administration.

C. The district, whenever possible, shall provide incentives for self-improvement.

D. The results of all evaluations shall be clearly and promptly reviewed with the person under evaluation.

E. All members of the certificated staff shall be clearly informed on the procedures for the evaluation and improvement of instruction and administration.

F. When employment status is placed in jeopardy or when an individual believes that an injustice has been done in personnel matters, he shall have regularized means of review and hearing by a group in which his peers are represented.
(Academic Due Process)

G. In evaluation of administrative personnel, a most important criterion should be the extent to which the positive leadership of the administrator has enabled those in his area of supervision to achieve success in their endeavors.

H. Because of the nature of the administrator's role in the educational program, administrative personnel should be evaluated both by those whom they lead or serve, and by those to whom they are accountable in the institutional hierarchy.

I. The primary responsibility for improvement remains with the individual staff member; however, assistance when needed shall be made available.

J. Evaluation of professional persons shall extend to their performance as professionals, and not to irrelevant, immaterial, or trivial matters.

K. A professional staff member may examine his evaluation folder at any time and copies of any and all material placed in the folder as a result of this evaluation procedure shall be given to the person under evaluation for his personal files.

L. Evaluation should be understood as a process involving criteria and procedures, rather than an isolated event.

APPENDIX B

M. This evaluation policy is intended to inspire confidence rather than fear, and to be supportive by removing threats of arbitrary punishment and punishment for improper reasons.

II. Evaluation of Instructors

A. Division level evaluation.

1. Peer Committee.

a. The Peer Committee shall be constituted as provided in Appendix 3. Membership on the Peer Committee shall be designated in the semester prior to the actual evaluation, in order to give Peer Committee members one unit assigned time for this duty.

b. The Peer Committee shall receive and become familiar with the Self-Evaluation (Appendix 1) and the Student-Evaluation (Appendix 2).

c. The Dean of Instruction may submit to the Peer Committee written information of an evaluative nature about the person under evaluation. Such information is to be considered advisory and not directive. Negative information shall be fully supported and documented, and hearsay evidence is to be discounted. The person under evaluation shall also be sent a copy of such information in order to have the opportunity to prepare and submit a rebuttal to the Peer Committee.

d. The Peer Committee shall conduct such visits and discussions as provided in Appendix 3.

e. At the conclusion of their investigations the Peer Committee shall vote either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" on the person under evaluation. As a general policy, the evaluation team should concentrate on making recommendations for improvement for the person who is under review for the first time. The team should make a finding of "satisfactory" in order to give the person the opportunity to make the necessary improvements in his job performance. The team should reserve the finding of "unsatisfactory" for extraordinary cases and for second and subsequent instances in which a person is under review.

f. In the event of a "satisfactory" vote, the Division Chairman shall send a letter to this effect to the Dean of Instruction and the case will be closed and no further action taken. The Division Chairman may recommend permanent status for probationary instructors in their first year.

g. In the event of a split vote, or a vote of "unsatisfactory" the Extended Peer Committee shall be constituted.

2. Extended Peer Committee

a. The two members of the Peer Committee shall select one additional person, and the three persons shall constitute the Extended Peer Committee. If the two members cannot agree on a third person, each of the two shall place the name of his nominee for the third person on a piece of paper. The two folded pieces of paper shall then be put in a hat, and the person under evaluation shall draw one of the names. The person so selected shall become the third member of the Extended Peer Committee.

b. The Extended Peer Committee shall conduct such additional investigations as shall seem necessary to them.

c. At the conclusion of their investigations the Extended Peer Committee shall vote either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" on the person under evaluation.

d. In the event of a "satisfactory" vote, the Division Chairman shall send a letter to this effect to the Dean of Instruction and the case will be closed and no further action taken.

e. In the event of an "unsatisfactory" vote, the Extended Peer Committee shall prepare a specific narrative report of the problems they observed which support their judgment of "unsatisfactory." This report shall not contain any material that is specifically prohibited by Section III, A-H of this policy.

f. In signing and forwarding the "unsatisfactory" report to the Dean of Instruction, the Division Chairman is certifying that he believes the judgment in the report to be factually supported and that the support does not depend upon anything prohibited by Section III, A-H of this policy. The person under evaluation shall also sign a statement indicating that he is familiar with its contents.

g. One week prior to the due date of the report to the Dean of Instruction, the report shall be forwarded to the person under evaluation as provided in Section IV, A of this policy.

h. All working papers and notes developed during the investigations of the Peer Committee and the Extended Peer Committee shall be delivered to the person under evaluation for his personal use. A copy of the report to the Dean of Instruction shall be retained and filed by the Division Chairman, and a copy provided to the person under evaluation. Recommendations for professional improvement made by the Peer Committee or Extended Peer Committee shall be given to the person under evaluation and filed by the Division Chairman.

APPENDIX B

B. Administrative level evaluation.

1. Full scale review.

a. The Dean of Instruction shall head an evaluation team in order to conduct a full scale review of faculty members who have been judged "unsatisfactory" by their peers in their division level evaluations. No full scale review may be initiated unless and until a judgment of "unsatisfactory" has been received about an instructor from his Division Chairman during the current semester.

b. The evaluation team shall consist of five persons: the Division Chairman of the division involved, a faculty member appointed by the person under evaluation, the Dean of Instruction, and two other members chosen by the first three. In the event that the Division Chairman is the person under evaluation, the Dean of Instruction shall appoint another faculty member to fill the Division Chairman's place on the team.

c. The evaluation team shall review the division report that was written in support of the "unsatisfactory" evaluation. The team shall also receive and study the student evaluation and self evaluation. Each case being different, the team shall outline a pattern of action to follow, given the specific case at hand. The actions taken by the team shall include such visits and conferences as may seem necessary in order to reach a valid judgment about the person under evaluation.

d. At the conclusion of the evaluation team's investigations, but prior to their vote, the person under evaluation may appear before the team. The team shall discuss their findings with the person under evaluation and he shall be provided the opportunity to respond and explain.

e. After the person under evaluation has been provided with ample opportunity to present his case, he may be excused. The team shall then have final discussions prior to voting either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" on the person under evaluation.

f. The Dean of Instruction shall notify the person under evaluation immediately on the result of the vote taken by the full scale evaluation team. In the event of a "satisfactory" vote, the Dean of Instruction shall send letters to this effect to the College President, the appropriate Division Chairman, and the person under evaluation. This closes the case and no further action shall be taken.

g. In the event of an "unsatisfactory" vote, the Dean of Instruction shall inform the person under evaluation of his right to counsel in subsequent proceedings, and of his rights in all subsequent proceedings. The Dean of Instruction shall then send a letter notifying the College President, the appropriate Division Chairman, and the person under evaluation of the "unsatisfactory" evaluation and of the date of the President's Hearing.

APPENDIX B

h. Following a vote of "unsatisfactory," the full scale evaluation team shall compose a careful and specific report of their findings in support of their judgment. This report shall not contain any material specifically prohibited by Section III, A-H of this policy. The report will be prepared for the signature of the College President, and addressed to the Board of Education of this District.

2. President's Hearing.

a. The person under "unsatisfactory" evaluation by a full scale evaluation team shall have a hearing with the College President, and may state his case. At this hearing he may be accompanied by his Counsel. The Dean of Instruction and the Division Chairman will be included, unless inappropriate.

b. The College President shall affirm that this report is the sum total of evaluative communication to the Board regarding the person under evaluation. This is to insure that nothing prohibited under Section III, A-H of this policy can be a factor in penalizing the person under evaluation.

c. The College President may decide against sending the "unsatisfactory" report to the Board, thereby closing the case.

d. The College President shall inform the person under "unsatisfactory" evaluation of the penalty he is recommending to the Board in a separate letter. He shall explain how this penalty is appropriate and is supported by the facts in the report by the Full Scale Review team.

e. In signing and forwarding the "unsatisfactory" report to the Board, the College President is certifying that he believes that the judgment in the report is factually supported and that the support does not depend upon anything prohibited by Section III, A-H of this policy.

f. One week prior to the due date of the report to the Board, the report shall be forwarded to the person under evaluation as provided in Section IV, A of this policy.

C. Board Action

1. Upon receipt of an "unsatisfactory" evaluation of a certificated employee of the GCCD, accompanied by the College President's recommendation of a specific penalty for that person, the Board of Education shall proceed with the requirements specified by law.

2. If the governing board decides it intends to dismiss or penalize a contract or regular employee, it shall deliver a written statement, duly signed and verified, to the employee, setting forth the complete and precise decision of the governing board and the reasons therefore. (Ed. Code 13482.35) Such reasons cannot depend upon anything specifically prohibited by Section III, A-H of this policy.

APPENDIX B

III. Protections and guarantees provided to the person under evaluation.

These guarantees supplement the procedural guarantees by putting limits on the scope and substance of evaluation. These limits define what is out of bounds so that the evaluators must focus only on what is professionally relevant. Without these limits the person under evaluation is vulnerable to having his employment status placed in jeopardy through the smallest breach of an undefined bias. Under such tyranny the teaching profession would sink into the deadliest mediocrity, and the public interest would suffer accordingly. Therefore, these limitations are central to the goal of improving instruction and administration.

A. No evaluation has any concern with matters within the scope of Academic Freedom. The scope of Academic Freedom as defined in this policy is the AAUP statement on Academic Freedom. A judgement of "unsatisfactory" cannot be supported with an allegation that violates Academic Freedom.

B. There is no such thing as orthodoxy in teaching methods, techniques, or point of view. A variety of approaches serves the needs of the students and allows the professional person to choose his or her own best approach to the job. A judgement of "unsatisfactory" cannot be supported with an allegation of the lack of orthodoxy in method, technique, or point of view. Only behavior in the classroom or in the administrative job that actually reduces job effectiveness can be used to support an "unsatisfactory" judgment.

C. It is in the interest of the academic profession to encourage active membership in professional or employee organizations. A judgment of "unsatisfactory" cannot be supported because of a person's membership in a professional or employee organization.

D. No evaluation can be concerned in any way with the private life of the instructor or administrator. A judgment of "unsatisfactory" cannot be supported with allegations relating to the outside political, social, or religious affiliations, beliefs, or behavior of the person under evaluation.

E. No evaluation may be concerned with the manner in which the person exercises his professional rights and responsibilities when that exercise includes the opposition to, and/or criticism of, the personnel and policies of the Administration, District Office, or the Board of Education. All such exercise of professional rights and responsibilities shall be considered corrective attempts, and in the public interest and in the best interest of the academic profession, and of the College. It is contrary to the public interest to prevent such criticism through fear of penalty or reprisal. A judgment of "unsatisfactory" cannot be supported with an allegation that the person opposed or criticized any campus or district administrator, Board member, or policy.

F. It is clearly in the public interest to promote the exercise of civil rights and political rights, especially for members of the academic profession. A judgment of "unsatisfactory" cannot be supported

by an allegation that the person exercised a civil or political right protected by the Constitution of the United States.

G. It is in the public interest to preserve and promote individual choice and expression in the area of private taste, etc. Factors such as fashion in personal dress, hair style, personality expression, and friendships are only remotely related to professional competence. A judgment of "unsatisfactory" cannot be supported by an allegation that means, essentially, that the person "does not get along". Only such matters that have actually resulted in persistent and serious disability to perform in the classroom or in the administrative job can be used to support an "unsatisfactory" judgment.

H. Some college and Board regulations are of major importance to the conduct of classroom instruction and the operation of the College. An evaluation of "unsatisfactory" that is supported by allegations of breach of campus or Board regulations must also prove that the alleged violations took place, and that they have had major consequences on classroom instruction or the operation of the college.

IV. Procedure through which the person under evaluation takes corrective action on improper "unsatisfactory" evaluations.

A. All reports in support of "unsatisfactory" judgments going from the Division Chairman to the Dean of Instruction, or from the College President to the Board shall be submitted to the person under evaluation no later than one week prior to their due date. This will allow the person under evaluation to determine if corrective action needs to be taken. Evaluations may not be forwarded before the due date unless and until they have been released by the person under evaluation or by the Judicial Board.

B. If, in the judgment of the person under evaluation, an "unsatisfactory" judgment is being supported by one or more of the immaterial matters specifically prohibited by Section III, A-H above, the person under evaluation may take the following actions:

1. Request to the Division Chairman or to the College President that the prohibited material be deleted from the recommendation, and that the overall judgment be reassessed in the light of this revision.

- a. If, upon resubmission to the person under evaluation, the revised report no longer contains material prohibited by Section III, A-H above, it shall be released and sent forward. The person under evaluation may submit a letter to accompany the report.

- b. If, in the judgment of the person under evaluation, the report still contains material prohibited by Section III, A-H above, he may request the Judicial Board to make a determination under the Academic Due Process.

APPENDIX B

2. The Judicial Board may make one of the following findings:

a. That the report is not being supported by material prohibited by Section III, A-H above, and the facts contained in the report are sufficient to support the "unsatisfactory" judgment.

b. That the report is being supported by material prohibited by Section III, A-H above. In this case the Judicial Board shall direct that the prohibited supporting material be deleted and that the overall evaluation be changed from "unsatisfactory" to "satisfactory" for lack of evidence.

V. In-Service Training

A. In college-wide program of in-service training shall be established and supervised by the Dean of Instruction.

B. In -Service Training includes conducting and attending workshops, seminars institutes, and lectures; making visits to off-campus sources of aid and information; doing research in your field that will aid instruction and administration; and doing field work in your subject area that contributes toward improving instruction and administration.

C. Incentive awards are designed primarily to assure that the desired activities take place, in order to improve instruction and administration. In order to maximize participation in the in-service training program, the following incentives are established:

1. Preparation of a workshop, seminar, or institute, and presenting it to those in attendance will be compensated at the rate of one semester unit salary credit for each three hours of presentation. Those already in the top salary column will be compensated at the rate of \$50.00 for each three hours of presentation.

2. Attending a workshop, seminar, or institute shall be compensated at the rate of one-half semester unit salary credit for each three hours in attendance. Those already in the top salary column shall be compensated at the rate of \$25.00 for each three hours in attendance.

3. Preparation of, and delivery of a lecture will be compensated at the rate of one-half semester unit of salary credit for each hour of presentation.

4. Attendance at a lecture shall be compensated at the rate of one-third semester unit of salary credit for each hour in attendance. Those already in the top salary column shall be compensated at the rate of \$25.00 for the presentation and \$10.00 for attendance at a lecture.

APPENDIX B

4. Attendance at a lecture shall be compensated at the rate of one-third semester unit of salary credit for each hour in attendance. Those already in the top salary column shall be compensated at the rate of \$25.00 for the presentation and \$10.00 for attendance at a lecture.

5. Attendance at a three to five-hour professional conference will be compensated at the rate of one-half semester unit of salary credit. Those already in the top salary column shall be compensated at the rate of \$25.00.

6. Visiting another college campus or other source of instructional information or resources will be compensated at the rate of one semester unit of salary credit for each three hours. Those already in the top salary column shall be compensated at the rate of \$50.00 for each hour of visit.

7. Conducting approved research in your field that yields instructional or administrative benefits shall be compensated at the rate of one semester unit salary credit for each 40 hours of research. Those already in the top salary column shall be compensated at the rate of \$35.00 for each five hours.

8. Performing field work in your area of specialization (or in related areas) shall be compensated at the rate of one semester unit of salary credit for each eight hours of field work. Those already in the top salary column shall be compensated at the rate of \$50.00 for each eight hours of field work.

9. Publication of scholarly works shall be compensated at the rate of one to five semester units of salary credit. Those already at the top of the salary column shall be compensated at the rate of \$50.00 per unit.

FACULTY SENATE PROPOSAL
APPENDIX I
SELF-EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR

- I. Rationale: Self-evaluation by each instructor may be helpful in (1) defining the goals of a course, (2) assessing his preparation for teaching that course, and (3) evaluating his performance.
However, it is necessary to bear in mind that self-evaluation cannot all be taken at face-value: some teachers may be far more critical than others.
- II. Method: Each instructor should fill out the Self-Evaluation questionnaire, and turn in to his Peer Committee a copy for each member, at least one week before they are due to meet with him.
- III. Questionnaire: (Please answer on a separate sheet or sheets, numbering your answers; sign each sheet, and staple to this questionnaire.)

Expertise in subject-matter:

1. Have you made yourself knowledgeable in all areas of the subject-matter of your courses? (Please answer separately for different subjects taught.)
2. In what areas of teaching your subject(s) are you strong?
3. In what areas of teaching your subject(s) are you weaker?
4. What are you doing, and what do you propose to do, in order to improve the areas in which you are weaker?
5. What are you doing to keep up with developments in your field(s)?

Instruction: techniques, effectiveness:

6. Have you established clear course objectives?
7. What techniques do you use in presenting the material in your course?
8. What techniques do you use in testing student comprehension, and how frequently?
9. How do your techniques of testing student comprehension also test you effectiveness in teaching the subject?
10. What techniques have you tried and abandoned, or tried and adopted?

Review of student evaluation:

11. In what ways do you respond to, accept, or reject student evaluation of you as a teacher?

Acceptance of responsibilities adjunct to the regular assignment:

12. Do you make yourself sufficiently available to students outside the class?
13. Do your students take sufficient advantage of your availability outside of class?
14. What could you do to encourage students to take advantage of special help you can offer?
15. Do you have any departmental or divisional responsibilities beyond your regular assignments?
16. Do you have any extra-curricular activities?

FACULTY SENATE PROPOSAL
APPENDIX 2

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR

I.-Rationale

Under the present conditions of instruction, students are the only direct observers of the total instructional process. As such, they can provide information useful to the improvement of instruction if they are asked the right questions. The College must insure that the student voice be both fair and effective, recognizing the potential as well as the limitations of the student as an evaluator of the instructor.

II. The Student Role

A. Aspects of instruction in which the student can evaluate

1. The extent of clarity in stating course objectives
2. The effectiveness of the teacher in stimulating learning
3. The degree of interest the course provoked for the particular student doing the evaluating
4. The student's reaction to classroom styles and formats
5. The student's suggestions for the improvement of the instruction being evaluated

B. Aspects of instruction which the student can NOT evaluate

1. The depth of the instructor's scholarship
2. The long-range effect of the instruction received
3. The instructor's goals and objectives

III. Method

A. During the fall semester of each year, the students will evaluate instruction. In the interests of fairness and accuracy, all classes of each instructor shall be polled.

B. The ASB Legislature will appoint a Student Evaluation Commission Chairman and members to administer the evaluation. The Dean of Student Activities will be responsible for the accuracy of the evaluation process, including accounting for used and unused questionnaires.

C. The following steps will be taken:

1. The Student Evaluation Commission will fill envelopes with the same number of questionnaires as students enrolled in the classes to be evaluated. The following information will appear on the outside of each envelope:
 - a. Instructor's name
 - b. Course name
 - c. Days and hours class meets

APPENDIX 2

2. The envelopes will be placed in the instructor's boxes over a period of five days. The instructors will have two weeks (from the last day envelopes are issued) within which they must have their classes evaluated.
3. On evaluation day the instructor will accomplish the following:
 - a. In the space provided on the outside of the envelope, he will sign his name and the number of students actually in class.
 - b. He will then turn over the envelope to a competent student in the class, who will act as clerk to administer the evaluation while the instructor steps out of the room.
4. The evaluation will proceed as follows:
 - a. The student clerk will open the envelope and read a set of instructions to the class. He will then distribute the evaluation questionnaires to the students, wait until they are filled out, and collect them. (All evaluation questionnaires will be returned to the envelope, including the blank ones.)
 - b. The student clerk will then take the envelope to Ad 106 and deposit it in the ballot box outside that office.
5. The Student Evaluation Commission will have the results of the evaluation tabulated and distributed to faculty and students. Completed questionnaires will be kept for one semester, in case any question of accuracy is raised.

IV. Questionnaire

Attached is a sample of the instrument to be used in the student evaluation of instruction.

APPENDIX 2

GLENDALE COLLEGE
STUDENT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

COURSE NAME _____

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____

Please evaluate the instructor of this course. You are our best source of information for improving his teaching. Evaluate your instructor on a 1 through 5 basis. Questions 1 through 9 are answered on the computer card. Question 10 is answered at the bottom of this page. DO NOT IDENTIFY YOURSELF.

- 5-----EXCELLENT
4-----ABOVE AVERAGE
3-----AVERAGE
2-----BELOW AVERAGE
1-----POOR

1. The instructor defines the goals of the course clearly.
 2. The instructor presents the material clearly and is willing to explain further if asked.
 3. The instructor defines your responsibility in reaching these goals clearly.
 4. The instructor attempts to make the class stimulating and interesting.
 5. The instructor's routine is professional. (Begins class on time, treats students equally, uses class time on course-related material).
 6. You are able to get personal help from this instructor if you need it.
 7. The grading policies of this instructor thus far have appeared fair.
 8. The instructor tolerates expressions of opinions differing from his own.
 9. How strongly would you recommend this instructor to a good friend whose educational goals are similar to yours?
-
10. What specific suggestions do you have for the improvement of this teacher's instruction?
(These suggestions will be handed to the instructor and will not be published.)